

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 13, 2009, has been carefully studied. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 17 and 18 currently appear in this application. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and formal allowance of the claims.

Priority

Submitted herewith is a translation of the priority document.

Election/Restrictions

It is noted that the restriction requirement has been made final. Claims 7-12, 17 and 18 are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to for reciting "the extrusion T-dye" rather than "T-die."

The present amendment corrects this inadvertent typographical error.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being in definite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to correct the indefiniteness.

Art Rejections

Claims 1-4, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or, in the event of applicant perfecting the claim to foreign priority, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kesagawa et al., US 2004/0108621.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kesagawa discloses that the resins for the edge portions (which are in the same position as a thermoplastic resin to form an outstretched film in the presently claimed method) are both enclosed by the resin, which is in the same position as the other thermoplastic resin in the presently claimed method in the crosswise direction of the resin film main body with the resin for the die portions. This is shown in Figures 3 and 5 of Kesagawa. As noted in paragraph 0017 and Figure 2 of the present application, these areas in which the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin overlap with each other in the method of Kesagawa must be removed, as the products formed with such overlap are unacceptable.

In order to minimize overlapping of the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin, the herein claimed method takes advantage of the difference in the melt viscosity between the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin that pass through the feed-block and the T-die so that the difference is at most 3000 poises at a shear rate of from 20 to 500 sec⁻¹.

Paragraph 0018 of the present specification explains how the overlapping is minimized during processing. The difference in the melt viscosity between the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin must be at most 3000 poises at a shear rate of from 20 to 500 sec⁻¹. Under these conditions, the other thermoplastic resin may coexist on both sides of the thermoplastic resin and will have a cross-sectional

profile as shown in the upper view of Figure 4. In this condition, the resin melts are widened through the manifold 6 and then ejected out via the die lip 3 of the T-die 2. The film so produced has substantially no overlapping, as shown in the lower part of Figure 4.

In contrast to the method claimed herein, Kesagawa teaches a method for positively producing the overlapping part of the thermoplastic resin and the other thermoplastic resin, particularly as described in paragraphs 0009 and 0010. This is exactly the opposite of the method claimed herein, which minimizes production of overlapping resins.

It should also be noted that Kesagawa discloses that the melt flow rate (MFR) is in the range of 0.5 to 2, and the degree of enclosing the resin for the middle portion with the edge portions is adjusted according to the difference in MFR between the resins (paragraph 0011). That means that Kesagawa positively teaches producing an overlapping part of the resins, which is contrary to the herein claimed method.

Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesagawa .

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled by the present amendment, so this rejection is now moot.

Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesagawa in view of Thompson, US 4,272,312.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 has been cancelled, so this rejection is now moot with respect to claim 16.

With respect to claim 6, Thompson discloses an extrusion process for two thermoplastic films in which thickened edge portions of the resin film are cut off. In contrast thereto, the presently claimed method does not produce overlapping edges, so there is nothing to be cut off.

With respect to Kesagawa, claim 6 depends from claim 1, and it is clear that Kesagawa teaches away from the method claimed in claim 1. Since Thompson also produces overlapping edges, it is respectfully submitted that neither Thompson nor Kesagawa even suggests the herein claimed process, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Art of Record

It is noted that the prior art made of record are merely cited as being of interest to the present disclosure.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\O\Ohta\Fujii10\Pto\2009-07-10Amendment.doc